DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 098 PS 023 010

AUTHOR Johnson, Jessie; And Others
TITLE Language Development Component: All Day Kindergarten Program 1992-1993. Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Program Evaluation.
PUB DATE 1 Jun 94
NOTE 26p.; For the 1989-90 report, see ED 329 362; for the 1990-91 report, see ED 345 834; for a report on a parallel program, see ED 351 673; for 1991-92 report, see ED 363 406.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; *Disadvantaged; *Full Day Half Day Schedules; *Intervention; *Kindergarten Children; *Literacy; Primary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Columbus Public Schools OH; Emergent Literacy; *Print Awareness

ABSTRACT

This report describes the All Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program undertaken at 18 elementary schools in Columbus, Ohio, and presents an evaluation of the language development component of the program. ADK provides an extra half day of instruction, using a language-based curriculum to reinforce the skills, concepts, and educational experiences taught in the regular kindergarten classroom. It was a desired outcome of ADK that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the program would demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they would successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concept about print test, "Balloons." An evaluation of the program found that, of the 247 pupils who attended at least 80 percent of the ADK sessions during the 1992-93 school year, 195 (78.9 percent) successfully completed at least 12 of 17 items on the "Balloons" test. Forty-seven pupils completed all 17 items correctly. The report recommends that ADK be continued in the 1993-94 school year, that program teachers be provided more inservice meetings, and that the program evaluator increase the number of classroom visits. An appendix provides copies of program evaluation forms. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 098

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

1992 - 1993

Written by:

Jessie Johnson
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Data Analysis by:

Kathy Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Program Evaluation
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

PS 023010

The Columbus City School District does not discriminate because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex or handicap with regard to admission, access, treatment or employment. This policy is applicable in all district programs and activities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM
1992-93

ABSTRACT

The All Day Kindergarten (ADK) Program was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in January 1972, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. Funding of the program was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund of 1992-93. The goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. It is an individualized language based program and provides reinforcement of the skills, concepts, and educational experiences taught in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1992-93 program goal, an equivalent of 14.5 program teachers served in 18 selected high priority schools. Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 12 pupils each.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 28, 1992. For evaluation based on test data (Desired Outcome 1), the time interval ended March 26, 1993. This provided a maximum of 113 possible days of instruction for ADK pupils. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, pupils must have attended at least 90.4 days.

Activities: Implementation of the program was accomplished through daily instructional activities to strengthen and extend regular classroom instruction without pursuing the basic reading readiness textbooks. Emphasis was placed on activities which would increase language development and enhance those skills needed to be successful in first grade.

Desired Outcome: Desired Outcome 1 stated that at least 50 percent of the pupils in the treatment group (those pupils who attend the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) will demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they will successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1.

Evaluation Design: The Evaluation Design included the one Desired Outcome stated above and the instrument used to measure it. Desired Outcome 1 was accomplished through the administration of the Balloons test, (locally constructed, 1990), developed by two coordinators from Federal and State Programs, under the Division of Elementary Schools. Analyses of the data included raw scores, minimum, maximum, and median scores.

Major Findings/Recommendations: Pupil census information indicated that the program served 405 pupils for an average of 10.8 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 335.4 pupils. The average number of days scheduled per pupil was 94.4 days and the average number of days pupils were served was 84.2 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 27.9.

ERIC

The attendance criterion for inclusion in Desired Outcome 1 was met by 247 pupils, which was 60.9 percent of the 405 pupils served. There were 342 pupils who received an administration of the Balloons test and had valid scores. The evaluation sample was comprised of those pupils who attended 80 percent of the program days and had a valid posttest score on the Balloons test (Desired Outcome 1). The data indicated of the 247 in the evaluation sample, 195 (78.9%) sample pupils successfully completed 12 of 17 items on the concepts about print test (Balloons); 47 (19.0%) of this number had all 17 items correct. The desired outcome was achieved.

Program teachers attended four inservice meetings during the school year. Overall, the meetings received a very positive rating of 4.7 on a 5 point scale by program teachers. Comments indicated teachers valued the opportunity to enhance their instructional skills, receive usable materials, and to receive information regarding evaluation procedures.

Process evaluation was conducted in all program schools to monitor pupil selection procedures of teachers. On-site visitation and inspection of records were instrumental in this process. The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed for those teachers visited; all ADK teachers had selection lists which indicated appropriate pupils were served and class schedules were posted as requested. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that the current record keeping process be maintained for use during the 1993-94 schools year.

It is recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1993-94 school year, and that consideration be given the following three recommendations to enhance program success: provide more teacher inservices, continue use of the current recordkeeping documents, and continue school visitations by the program evaluator.

ERIC

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

1992-93

Program Description

The All Day Kindergarten Program was instituted in the Columbus Public Schools in January 1972, for the purpose of providing a full day of instruction for underachieving kindergarten pupils. Funding of the program for 1992-93 was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. The overall goal of the program is to prepare pupils for first grade. The program provides pupils with an extra half day of instruction in addition to the half day of instruction provided in the regular kindergarten classroom. It is an individualized language based program and provides reinforcement of the skills, concepts, and educational experiences taught in the regular kindergarten classroom. The program operates on the philosophy that the additional help and attention provided by the program will better prepare underachieving kindergarten pupils for successful learning experiences in first grade.

To reach the 1992-93 program goal, an equivalent of 14.5 program teachers served in 18 selected high priority elementary schools. The schools are listed below.

Arlington Park	Eakin	Linden
Clinton	E. Linden	McGuffey
Como	Eastgate	N. Linden
Cranbrook	Huy	Reeb
Dana	Indian Springs	Southwood
Deshler	Koebel	W. Mound

Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 12 pupils each.

Evaluation Design

Desired Outcomes

One Desired Outcome (performance objective) to be achieved by program pupils was delineated for the All Day Kindergarten Program as follow:

Desired Outcome 1: At least 50 percent of the kindergarten pupils in the treatment group (those pupil who attended the program at least 80 percent of the instructional period) will demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they will successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (**Balloons**). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1.

ERIC

For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 28, 1992. For evaluation based on test data (Desired Outcome 1), the time interval ended March 26, 1993. This provided a maximum of 113 possible days of instruction for ADK pupils. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, sample pupils must have attended at least 90.4 days.

For program selection purposes, all kindergarten pupils were administered two selection instruments, Early Development Checklist and Letter Identification, locally developed, 1991, by program staff between September 3-25, 1992. Each test was scored and yielded a total raw score. Using the Kindergarten Scoring Matrix, each pupil's raw scores on the two selection instruments were converted to a single selection score. Pupils scores were rank ordered from lowest to highest and recorded on the Program Selection List Form. Teachers served pupils with the lowest selection score (serving no more than 12 pupils). Those pupils who did not receive immediate service were placed on a waiting list and were to receive service as other pupils exited the program.

Instruments

The evaluation design for the All Day Kindergarten program called for the collection of data in three areas. A copy of each instrument is found in the Appendix B, with the exception of the computer generated Pupil Roster.

1. Test Information

   The Early Development Checklist and Letter Identification[1] (locally developed, 1991) were used to assess and select pupils for program inclusion. Both instruments are measures included in the Kindergarten Assessment Portfolio (see Footnote, Appendix A, p. 9). All kindergarten pupils in program schools were administered the tests between September 3-25, 1992 by program staff. See Appendix B, pp. 11-12, for copies of scoring sheets for both instruments.

   The Balloons: A Concepts About Print Assessment[1] (locally constructed, 1991) was used to assess kindergarten pupil's Concepts About Print. The Balloons test is a criterion-referenced measure from the Kindergarten Assessment Portfolio (see Footnote, Appendix A, p. 9). Program pupils were administered the test the week of March 29, 1993 by program teachers. See Appendix B, pp. 13-14, for a copy of the Balloons Scoring Sheet.

2. Pupil Census Information

   The Calendar Worksheet. The Calendar Worksheet (locally constructed) was used to record pupil service information and Selection Scores (see Appendix B, p. 15).

   Pupil Data Sheet. A Pupil Data Sheet (locally constructed) was completed at the end of the year by ADK teachers for each pupil served. This instrument was used to collect the following information: pupil progress, hours per week of instruction, English-speaking status, number of days of pupil service, and the Balloons test score (see Appendix B, p.16).

   Pupil Roster. The Pupil Roster was completed by program teachers to indicate official enrollment of each pupil in the program. Program teachers identified pupils served from a computer generated list of all kindergarten pupils in their building Information included pupil name, student number, date of birth, program teacher name, school code, and program code.

3. Inservice Evaluation Information

All Day Kindergarten teachers were provided with an orientation inservice in September, 1992; they were asked to respond to the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form (see Appendix B, pp. 17-18) at the end of the session. In addition, three inservice sessions were provided for program teachers during September. At the end of each session program teachers were asked to rate the value of the session by completing the General Inservice Evaluation Form (see Appendix B, p. 19).

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained via on-site visitations to program classrooms. Findings are discussed later in this report.

Major Findings

The pupil census information is summarized in Table 1. The program served 405 pupils for an average of 10.8 hours of instruction per week. Of the total pupils served, all but one pupil was English speaking and none were identified as special education pupils. The average daily membership in the program was 335.4 pupils. The average number of days scheduled per pupil was 94.4 days and the average number of days pupils were served was 84.2 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 27.9.

Table 1

Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days Scheduled, Days Served, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week for ADK Program 1992-93

Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days Scheduled	Average Days Served	Average Daily Membership	Average Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week
405	191	214	94.4	84.2	335.4	10.8

The evaluation sample was comprised of those pupils who attended 80 percent of the program days and had a valid posttest score (for Desired Outcome 1). The attendance criterion was met by 247 pupils, which was 60.9% of the 405 pupils served. Of those pupils who received a spring administration of the concepts about print test, 342 had a valid Balloons test score. Data from testing are presented in Table 2.

The results of analyses of Balloons test data for raw score, minimum, maximum, and median are shown in Table 2. The median number of items correct on the posttest was 15. Raw scores on the test ranged from 2 to 17.

Desired Outcome 1 called for 50 percent of the evaluation sample to demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they would successfully complete 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Desired Outcome 1 was met with 78.9% (195) of the pupils successfully completing 12 or more items on the Balloons test at the end of the treatment period; 19.0% (47) were successful in completing all 17 items.

Table 2

Minimum, Maximum, and Median for the
Balloons Posttest Raw Scores for ADK Program
1992-93

	Posttest			Met Program Objective	
N[a]	Min.	Max.	Median	n	%
247	2	17	15	195	78.9

[a]Number of Evaluation Sample pupils.

Although the results for the number of correct responses have been presented, the reader should be wary of trying to extrapolate these results into comparisons or make generalizations concerning other pupils in the general kindergarten population. Only a posttest was administered, no pretest was given. The results best reflect pupils' mastery of the specified program objective and preclude valid opportunities to make comparisons across projects using different tests.

All Day Kindergarten program teachers attended four inservice meetings during September, 1992. The ADK teachers were asked to complete an evaluation form at the close of each meeting. The topics and dates of these meetings were: (a) The Opening Orientation Inservice on, September 3, 1992; (b) Teaching Strategies for the 1992-93 School Year, September 15, 1992; (c) Interactive Writing for the 1992-93 School Year, September 16, 1992; and (d) Learning to Look at Print, September 18, 1992. The opening Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form (September 3, 1992) and the General Inservice Evaluation Form were completed by a total of 43 participants at all meetings (see Appendix B, p. 17-19). The evaluation results of the content presented at the meetings is summarized for ADK teachers in Table 3.

Overall, the meetings received a very positive rating of 4.7 on a 5 point scale by program teachers. The evidence shows that all of the program teachers perceived the inservice sessions to be worthwhile and informative; the data also indicated that there was time to ask questions and questions were answered adequately during the meetings (see Table 3). Teachers did not often respond to the open-ended items provided on the evaluation form. The comments made were generally diverse in nature, but informative. Respondents valued having the opportunity to enhance their instructional strategies, to receive usable materials and ideas, and to receive information regarding evaluation procedures. It should be noted that the opening Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form was specifically designed to address concerns regarding the opening inservice (see Appendix B, pp. 17-18). Results for items 1-4 of the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form are included in Table 3. The average response for the Program Coordinators was 4.6 and 4.7 for the Evaluator's presentation (overall average) on a 5-point rating scale.

Process evaluation for the school year (1992-93) included: (1) the collection and review of Calendar Worksheets, and (2) school visits by the program evaluator to review records. Process evaluation conducted to monitor record keeping procedures of program teachers occurred at three points in the year, November 1992 and February 1993 (Calendar Worksheets) and January 5, 1993 (School visits). Each program teacher was asked to send copies of the Calendar Worksheet for a randomly selected group of

Table 3

Number and Average Responses to Inservice Statements
for All Meetings During 1992-93 School Year

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Responses SD (1)	D (2)	U (3)	A (2)	SA (1)
I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	42	4.7	0	0	0	13	29
The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	42	4.7	0	0	0	11	31
There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	43	4.8	0	0	0	10	33
Questions were answered adequately.	43	4.8	0	0	0	10	33

Note: Items were rated using a 5-point scale where SD = Strongly Disagree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

program pupils to the program evaluator. The Calendar Worksheet was designed to document the days of pupil program service (see Appendix B, p. 15). Worksheets were reviewed to see if they were properly coded; those in error were corrected by phone or a short note. Needed information was supplied to those teachers having additional concerns. Calendar Worksheets were generally found to be in compliance with evaluation guidelines.

In January, 1993 the program evaluator visited all program teachers to review records. More specifically, the purpose of these visits was to review both pupil selection data, which was to be posted, and other related record keeping documents to insure that appropriate pupils were served -- even if served for only one day. All ADK program classrooms were visited from January 5, 1993 to March 1, 1993.

The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed during the visits. All teachers had selection lists with pupil's test scores correctly rank ordered for selection purposes and appropriate pupils were served, however, suitable notation was not always made for illegible pupils listed for service, but not served, as requested. Class schedules were posted as requested. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that these forms be kept for record keeping purposes and used during the 1993-94 school year and that teachers should be given more opportunities to meet during the year.

Summary/Recommendation

The All Day Kindergarten Program provided underachieving kindergarten pupils with an extra half day of instruction, in addition to the half day they received in a regular kindergarten classroom. The overall goal of the program was to prepare pupils for first grade. To reach the 1992-93 program goal, an equivalent of

14.5 program teachers served in 18 elementary schools. Each All Day Kindergarten teacher provided daily instruction for two groups of pupils. Groups were limited to 12 pupils each.

For evaluation purposes, the All Day Kindergarten Program started on September 28, 1992. For evaluation based on test data (Desired Outcome 1), the time interval ended March 26, 1993. This provided a maximum of 113 possible days of instruction for ADK pupils. To meet the attendance criterion (80%) for inclusion in the analyses of Desired Outcome 1, pupils in the evaluation sample must have attended at least 90.4 days. The criteria for inclusion in the evaluation sample (Desired Outcome 1) included: (a) attendance for 80 percent of the program days; and (b) a valid posttest score. The attendance criterion was met by 247 pupils which was 60.9% of the 405 pupils served. Of the 405 pupils served, 342 pupils received an administration of the criterion-referenced test and had a valid score on the Balloons test.

The first objective (Desired Outcome 1) called for at least 50 percent of the kindergarten pupils in attendance for at least 80 percent of the instructional period to demonstrate an awareness of early concepts about print such that they would successfully complete at least 12 of 17 items on a concepts about print test (Balloons). Successful completion of at least 12 of 17 items is considered appropriate for promotion to grade 1. The data indicated of those tested in the evaluation sample, 195 (78.9%) pupils successfully completed 12 or more of the 17 items on the test and 47 (19.0%) pupils successfully completed all 17 items. The median number of items correct on the posttest was 15. Raw scores on the test ranged from 2 to 17. The data indicated that 78.9% of the pupils attained the Desired Outcome.

All Day Kindergarten program teachers attended four inservice meetings during September, 1992. The ADK teachers were asked to respond to the Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form (September 3, 1992) and the General Inservice Form at the close of each meeting. The topics and dates of these meetings were: (a) The Opening Orientation Inservice on, September 3, 1992; (b) Teaching Strategies for the 1992-93 School Year, September 15, 1992; (c) Interactive Writing for the 1992-93 School Year, September 16, 1992; and (d) Learning to Look at Print, September 18, 1992. The Orientation Inservice Evaluation Form and the General Inservice Evaluation Form were completed by a total of 43 participants at all meetings. The evidence shows that all of the program teachers perceived the inservice sessions to be worthwhile and informative; the data also indicated that there was time to ask questions and questions were answered adequately during the meetings.

Process evaluation was conducted to monitor pupil selection procedures of teachers. On-site visitation and inspection of records were instrumental in this process. The data indicated no major problems regarding the documents reviewed for those teachers visited. Informally, teachers expressed a desire that the current record keeping process be maintained for use during the 1993-94 school year and that teachers should be given more opportunities to meet during the year.

Based on the evaluation results, it is recommended that the All Day Kindergarten program be continued in the 1993-94 school year. The following recommendations are made to enhance program success:

1. Program teachers should be provided more inservice meetings to: (a) share instructional ideas to increase skills and broaden their base of understanding of beginning readers as it relates to the new reading series; and (b) to receive information regarding evaluation procedures.

2. The program evaluator should increase classroom visitation to enhance the record keeping process, respond to questions about evaluation requirements, and obtain pertinent information. These visits provide useful information regarding evaluation and related concerns of the program teachers.

Reference

Columbus Public Schools. (1991). Kindergarten Assessment Portfolio Columbus, OH: Competency Based Education Department. Federal and State Programs. Department of Program Evaluation.

P:\P504\RPTADK93
6-1-94 1:21 PM

Appendix A

Footnotes

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Footnotes

[1]The Kindergarten Assessment Team under the direction of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood Education Department, developed a packet of instruments called the Kindergarten Assessment Portfolio. This portfolio was written for the Columbus City School district under the direction of the Competency Based Education Department, Federal and State Programs, in conjunction with the Department of Program Evaluation, in Summer 1991. The purpose of the packet of instruments was to assist the teacher in forming an accurate portrait of the total child.

ERIC

Appendix B

Instruments

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

PLACE LABEL HERE

STUDENT NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ _ BIRTHDATE _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
M M D D Y Y

NAME _ _ _ _ _ _ _

LETTER IDENTIFICATION SCORING SHEET

Date: _____ School: _____

Classroom Teacher: _____

LETTER	SCORE	LETTER	SCORE
A	___	a	___
G	___	g	___
M	___	m	___
S	___	s	___
Y	___	y	___
C	___	c	___
W	___	w	___
Q	___	q	___
K	___	k	___
E	___	e	___
I	___	t	___
O	___	i	___
U	___	o	___
B	___	u	___
H	___	b	___
N	___	h	___
T	___	n	___
Z	___	t	___
F	___	z	___
L	___	f	___
R	___	l	___
X	___	r	___
D	___	a	___
J	___	x	___
P	___	d	___
V	___	j	___
		p	___
		v	___
		g	___
COLUMN TOTAL	/26	COLUMN TOTAL	/29

TOTAL /55

Directions:

1. Be certain you have completed the required information at the top of the form on the reverse side.
2. In the SCORE column, place a 1 if the pupil responded correctly. If the pupil's response was incorrect, place a 0 in the blank. If the pupil did not attempt to identify the letter, do not mark anything on the line.
3. Record the COLUMN TOTALS in the spaces provided.
4. Record the TOTAL for all items in the space provided.
5. After completing this form, return the original to your program evaluator at 52 Starling Street and keep a copy for yourself.

SCORING SHEET FOR **BALLOONS**

Name _____ School _____

Date _____ Room _____

PROCEDURES	DIRECTIONS	CRITERIA	YES	NO	OBJECTIVES
Hold the book vertically by the outside edge, spine toward the child.	"I'm going to read this book to you, but I want you to help me." "Show me the front of the book."	Child must point to front cover of the book.			Child knows front from back of book.
READ THE TITLE OF THE BOOK					
Open the book to page 2.	"I'll read this story. You help me. Show me where to start reading."	Child must point to any part of the page with text.			Child knows that the print, not the picture, carries the message.
READ PAGE 2					
Turn to page 4/5	"Where do I start to read?"	Child must point to the word "I".			Child knows to begin reading at top left of the print.
	"Which way do I go?"	Child must indicate left to right movement across top line of print.			Child knows left to right movement.
	"Where do I go next?"	Child must point to the word "and".			Child knows return sweep.
READ PAGE 4 AND MODEL POINTING					
Turn to page 6/7	"Where do I start to read?"	Child must point to any place on page 6.			Child knows that left page is read before right page.
READ PAGE 6 AND MODEL POINTING					
Point to page 7	"You point while I read this page."	Child must point to each word as it is read slowly.			Child knows one-to-one word match.
READ PAGE 7					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROCEDURES	DIRECTIONS	CRITERIA	YES	NO	OBJECTIVES
Turn to page 9	"You point while I read."	Child must point to each word as it is read slowly.			Child knows one-to-one word match.
READ PAGE 9					
Turn to page 11	"Now you point and read."	Child must read and point correctly to each word as he reads it.			Child knows one-to-one word match and is able to read accurately.
Turn to page 13	"You point and read."	Child must read and correctly point, etc.			Same as above.
Turn to page 14	"You point and read."	Child must read and correctly point, etc.			Same as above.
Turn to page 15	"You point and read."	Child must read accurately.			Child is able to read accurately.
READ PAGE 17					
Teacher directs student to move cards to complete each task.					
DEMONSTRATE					
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me one letter."	Child must show one letter only.			Child knows concept of a letter.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me two letters."	Child must show two letters only.			Child knows concept of two letters.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me one word."	Child must show one word only.			Child knows concept of a word.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me two words."	Child must show two words only.			Child knows concept of two words.
Place the cards outside the print.	"Move these cards and show me a 'capital' or 'upper case' letter."	Child must show the capital letter.			Child knows concept of capital letter.
		Total Number of 'YES' Responses			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALENDAR WORKSHEET FOR COMPUTING DAYS OF PUPIL SERVICE
1992-93
Instructional Assistant and All Day Kindergarten Programs

Student Legal Name _____ _____
Last, First

Student Birthdate __ __ __ __ __ __
M M D D Y Y

Student Number __ __ __ __ __ __

Race Code ____ (1-5)

Sex ____ (M or F)

Note: Please keep original worksheets for all pupils (even for pupils who leave). Do not send to program coordinator or to other schools.

Grade Level 0 0

Selection Score __ __

Teacher Name _____

Assistant _____ (where appropriate)

Program Code __ __ __ __ __

School _____

School Code __ __ __

1992-93	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	M	T	W	TH	F	SUB-TOTALS Scheduled (1,2)	SUB-TOTALS Served (2)
Aug. 31 - Sept 25	M	M	2	3	4	H	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	21	22	23	24	25	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\
Sept. 28 - Oct. 23	28	29	30	1	2	5	6	7	8	9	12	13	14	15	COTA	19	20	21	22	23		
(Max schdl days=19)															0							
Oct. 26 - Nov 20	26	27	28	29	30	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	PC		
(Max schdl days=19)																				0		
Nov. 23 - Dec. 18	23	24	25	H	N	30	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18		
(Max schdl. days=18)				0	0																	
Jan. 4 - Jan 29	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15	H	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	28	29		
(Max schdl days=19)											0											
Feb. 1 - Feb. 26	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	PC	22	23	24	25	26		
(Max schdl. days=19)															0							
Mar. 1 - Mar. 26	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	26		
(Max schdl. days=20)																						
Mar. 29 - Apr. 23	29	30	31	1	2	5	6	7	8	N	N	N	N	N	N	19	20	21	22	23	//////////	//////////
(Max. schdl. days=0)										0	0	0	0	0	0						\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\
Apr. 26 - May 21	26	27	28	29	30	3	4	5	6	7	10	11	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	21	//////////	//////////
(Max schdl. days=0)											0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\
May 24 - June 11	24	25	26	27	28	H	1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	R	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////	//////////	//////////
(No scheduled days)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\	\\\\\\\\\\

TOTALS Scheduled			Served		

SERVICE CODES:

0 = Pupil Not Scheduled (Inservice, Teacher Illness, Personal Day, Snow Day, Parent Conference Day, etc.)
1 = Pupil Scheduled and Not Served (Absent from School/Class: Field Trips, Assemblies, Time Out, Testing, etc.)
2 = Pupil Served

RACE/ETHNIC CODES:

1 = Non Minority
2 = Black
3 = Spanish Surname
4 = Asian American
5 = American Indian

ALPHABETIC CODES:

(Write codes to LEFT of Date – Not in Service Code Fields)
E = Entered
W = Withdrawn

Kindergarten
(Maximum Scheduled = 114)
(Maximum Served = 114)

P:\P602\CALENDWS 21
9-1-92

22

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Columbus Public Schools
Compensatory Education Programs

March 31, 1993
15:37

SHEET 13

PUPIL DATA SHEET

SCHOOL CODE _ _ _ PROGRAM CODE 9 3 0 0 2 SSN _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

SCHOOL NAME _____ PROGRAM NAME _____ TEACHER NAME _____

1. STUDENT NAME _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ / _
last first mi

2. STUDENT NO. _ _ _ _ _ _ GRADE _ _ BIRTHDATE _ _ / _ _ / _ _

3. AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK OF INSTRUCTION [| | | . | |]

4. PUPIL PROGRESS NONE SOME MUCH

5. IS THIS PUPIL ENGLISH SPEAKING? NO YES

THRU 03-26-93

6. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE SCHEDULED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS) [| | |]

7. NUMBER OF DAYS SERVICE RECEIVED (CAREFULLY READ INSTRUCTIONS) [| | |]

8. BALLOONS SCORE [| |] OF POSSIBLE 17.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prepared by
Office of the Superintendent
Department of Program Evaluation (pif pds)

ESEA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93 ORIENTATION

Date of Orientation Meeting _____ A.M.____P.M.____ALL DAY____

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) Reading-Elementary (1-5)
(2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
(3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
(4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
(5) N or D (1-12)
(6) Nonpublic (1-8)
(7) Reading Recovery (1)
(8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
(9) Instructional Assistant - K
(10) ADK
(11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
(12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
(13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Program Coordinators' Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
6. Program Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

Please turn over for questions 7-9

7. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

8. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

9. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1992-93

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/_____ (e.g., 03/05/93)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____all day _____a.m. _____p.m. _____after school

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ESEA Chapter 1 Programs:
- (1) Reading Elementary (1-5)
- (2) Mathematics-Elementary (3-5)
- (3) Reading-Middle School (6-8)
- (4) Mathematics-Middle School (6-8)
- (5) N or D (1-12)
- (6) Nonpublic (1-8)
- (7) Reading Recovery (1)
- (8) Early Literacy (1-2)

DPPF Programs:
- (9) Instructional Assistant - K
- (10) ADK
- (11) Early Literacy - 2

General Fund Program:
- (12) HSCA/SSS

Other (Specify)
- (13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting? _____

_____

7. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?
   a) _____
   b) _____
   c) _____